



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The Animal DUN in the Sumerian Inscriptions.—By
IRA MAURICE PRICE, University of Chicago.

Lists of animals that came down from the period of the supremacy of the cities of Ur and Lagash contain among them one whose identity is still a matter of doubt. I have gathered up the facts known about this animal as a possible aid in determining its identity.

The inscriptions from the period of Lagash (2500—2400 B. C.) give us most of our data. De Genouillac in his *Tablettes Sumeriennes Archaiques* has indicated some of the facts regarding this animal; others may be found in Gudea Cylinder B, and in Hussey's *Sumerian Tablets in Harvard Museum*.

De Genouillac after putting together the facts which he collected (T. S. A. p. XLIII f.) concluded that there must have been two kinds of DUN, (1) a wild DUN of the swamps (*DUN-giš-gi*) and (2) a DUN of the plains (*DUN-ù*). The former DUN seems to be referred to in Gudea Cyl. B, XV, 12—14, where it is listed with work cattle, and worked with some kind of an instrument, that corresponded to the yoke of the ox or the packsaddle of the ass. The words used to describe the instrument would indicate that it was made of metal (*DUN-e uru^{du}ha* []-mah; cf. *ha-zi zabar R. T. C.*, 22).

In Gudea Cyl. B, IX, 16—19, the DUN seems to be associated with the ass, or was a kind of ass, in such expressions as (16) *anšu DUN úr-bi* — — — — (18) *anšu-sig-a anšu-Erida^{ki}* (19) *anšu DUN-da*. Whether this may have been some species of mule, or some cross between the *anšu* and another animal is not apparent in the passage. On Cyl. B, IX, 16, we find exactly the same phrase as on Cyl. A, VII, 20, except that *anšu* is omitted in the latter case, which would seem to indicate that, here, at least, *anšu* DUN and DUN alone are synonymous, for in both cases the same animal is referred to, viz., the animal called *ug-kaš*. On Cyl. B, IX, 16—19, as referred to above, we find the young ass, and the

ass of Eridu, but what could have been *anšu-DUN*? Was it merely a full-grown *anšu* or some other animal? Or—could it have been some species of wild ass or bison which roamed in herds in the swamps or lowlands of Babylonia, as the wild asses do today in the steppes of Tibet? We know that the Assyrians hunted them in the chase as pictured on the monuments. M. J. E. Gautier in his excavations at Susa has shown that the bison has been in existence from a very remote antiquity.

When we turn to the numerous lists of large animals we discover the DUN classified with asses. De Genouillac cites numerous cases: In *R. T. C.*, 49, we find one list of 17 she-asses, 10 female and 4 male DUN, and all totaled as 30 (31) asses. Another case gives credence to this proposition, where a deal consists of a purchase of 4 she-asses and 2 DUN, which is called an "affair of the asses". When the money value of each is set side by side it is noteworthy that the less value is attached to the DUN. In one inscription (*R. T. C.* 50) the cash value of the DUN was 4 to 6 shekels while that of the ass was 20 shekels.

Again, the service of a DUN of a year or less old by the month was 50 to 70 *qa*, for a DUN of two years 80 to 100 *qa* for an adult DUN 300 *qa*, probably designating a large animal.

Another little hint of especial interest is the fact that the DUN yielded butter or cream, *iá-DUN* (*R. T. C.* 18, 62, 63). Is this to be compared with the same product supplied by the cow or the goat?

An examination of the *Sumerian Tablets of Harvard Museum* reveals some additional facts. Of the 224 women mentioned on the 54 tablets published in Part I, I find 20 were *gim DUN-nig-kú-a*, that is, a title indicating "care-taker of the DUN to be eaten". This title is mentioned 55 times, and shows that the DUN mentioned on those tablets were of a sufficiently docile nature to be managed by women. One man, mentioned 23 times in these inscriptions, named *Lugal-pa-ud-du* is called *sib-DUN*, shepherd of the DUN, or rather DUN-herd. He is also named several times in de Genouillac, *T. S. A.* (10 Rev. V, 18, 19; 11 Rev. IV; 12 Rev. V).

Another man, *Nimgir-eš-a-gub*, was a *gab-ra DUN-ú* (23 Rev. VII, 16), evidently an overseer of the DUN. One woman

Šag-tar held the same office as attested in *S. T.* 22 Rev. V, 7 and *T. S. A.* (de Genouillac).

One woman's name has incorporated in it this element, though it may not have had anything to do with the animal: *Nin-DUN-ama-mu* (23 Obv. I, 11).

Pinches found in the Amherst Tablets (36, III, 9) the name of a farmer whose chief business seems to have been that of raising the DUN or asses, or both: *Šur dingir DUN-sig-êa*.

The DUN mentioned in these inscriptions of Harvard Museum seems to have been an animal similar to the goat, docile, yielding milk, having a hide of value, and a ruminant, living of the fields. In all the 54 tablets published in Hussey's *S. T.* only two men are mentioned as bearing any relation to the care of the DUN, while women are named in 55 passages as care-takers.

On the other hand, the DUN described alongside the ass and oxen is always cared for by men, and is classified with asses or oxen in the totals, as a beast of burden, and seems to have thriven in swamps or forests. Its value was less than that of the ass, and it required less food for its maintenance.

What were these two species of DUN?¹ Have we the modern equivalent of either of them?

It is now almost a question for the zoologist.

¹ Allotte de la Fuÿe, in Hilprecht's Anniversary Volume, p. 126, N. 2, Thureau-Dangin in *R. A.* VI p. 137, and again Thureau-Dangin in *Inventaire des Tablettes de Tello*, I, p. 27, Note 3, offer suggestions for the solution of the problem, which do not quite satisfy the requirements of the cases, especially in the Gudea Cylinders and Hussey's *S. T.*